

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/014,291	10/26/2001	Stephan von Horsten	20488/12 U.S.	9996	
75	7590 05/13/2004		EXAMINER		
Mark A. Hofer, Esq. Brown, Rudnick, Freed & Gesmer One Financial Center			CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Boston, MA 0	2111		1646		
			DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004	DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,291	HORSTEN ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Olga N. Chernyshev	1646
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
THE REPLY FILED 06 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION OF A STATE OF STATE O	N FOR ALLOWANCE.  ation. A proper reply to a  n places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing a FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	·	,
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: Proposed amendment of claim 2 requires	s new search and consideration.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant presented arguments that were fully answered before in the earlier communications from the office..

OLGA N. CHERNYSHEV, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER